

PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.
1700 Broadway, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80290
phone: (303) 831-8100 • telecopy (303) 831-8208

MEETING MINUTES

TO: Distribution **DATE:** February 16, 1995
FROM: Philip A. Nixon **PROJECT:** Solar Ponds Phase I IM/IRA
MEMO #: SP307:022295.01

ATTENDANCE:

Harlen Ainscough, CDPHE
Briand Wu, DOE
Steve Howard, SAIC/DOE
Andy Ledford, EG&G
Tim Kramer, EG&G
Lee Pivonka, G&M
John Haasbeek, ERM
Arturo Duran, EPA

DISTRIBUTION:

Frazer Lockhart, DOE
Scott Surovchak, EPA
Mark Austin, EG&G
Michelle McKee, EG&G
Steve Keith, EG&G
Steve Cooke, EG&G
Toni Forbes, EG&G
M. Matthews, EG&G
(Admin. Record) (2)
Jeff Ciocco, DOE
Jesse Roberson, DOE
Bob Siegrist, LATO
Eric Graham, ERM
Alan McGregor, ERM
Marcia Dibiasi, IGO

B. Cropper
W. Edmonson
T. Evans
J. Hartfelder
H. Heidkamp
R. Henry
S. Hughes
D. Kennedy
R. Lux
R. McConn
D. Myers
A. Putinsky
R. Stegen
S. Stenseng
R. Schmiermund
T. Kuykendall
Central Files

SUBJECT: Weekly Status Meeting

1) Ratification of Previous Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the previous meeting of February 9, 1995 were reviewed and ratified with a few minor corrections.

Harlen Ainscough indicated that the CDPHE is considering recommending to the DOE that a low-level waste disposal unit be considered for construction at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS). The CDPHE would likely stipulate the type of wastes and concentrations that could be disposed. Since the siting, design and permitting of a new waste

management unit could be a lengthy process (5-10 years expected) it is not certain if this would impact the OU4 closure.

Harlen Ainscough also stated that the CDPHE had briefed the governor with respect to onsite disposal needs relating to contaminated soil quantities and concentration levels. Mr. Ainscough reported that the governor may not be opposed to low-level radionuclide disposition onsite, but indicated his desire for a lined unit. It was discussed the governor needed to be educated with respect to why the working group decided against a liner system in favor of the passive subsurface drain. It was suggested that the video tape be sent to the governors office.

Arturo Duran pointed out that a liner system is not required if an equivalent system is proposed. The working group considers that the subsurface drain is more applicable than a liner system for the OU4 closure.

2) Public Comment on the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document and Permit Modification Request

Andy Ledford specified that there are 2 issues that require resolution:

- Is a second public review required for the regulatory agency prepared permit?
- If a second public review is required, then how should it be scheduled?

Harlen Ainscough stated that the second public review was required because the CDPHE must prepare the permit for the Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) and the permit requires public comment. The IM/IRA-EA DD does not suffice as the CDPHE CAMU permit. Arturo Duran indicated that he wanted to review the administrative procedures and the IAG to determine if this second review is necessary since all the information regarding the CAMU request is included in the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document.

Mr. Ainscough intends on drafting the CDPHE permit while the public is reviewing the proposed IM/IRA-EA Decision Document and issuing it for public review while the DOE is preparing the responsiveness summary.

Andy Ledford discussed a draft schedule for the second public review. Steve Howard requested that Mr. Ainscough discuss this schedule with his permitting counterparts at the CDPHE because the current schedule requests approval of the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document prior to the submittal of the final Title II design package. Mr. Howard indicated that the CDPHE would not allow this strategy on a previous project. A separate meeting may be established between DOE and the regulatory agencies to discuss this issue.

3) Errata in the Contaminant Level Comparison Table in the IM/IRA-EA DD

Andy Ledford reported that the pondcrete/sludge data had been reviewed to finalize the response to a CDPHE question and it was discovered that the sludge data which Parsons ES used to calculate the mass of the contaminants beneath the engineered cover was in slight error. New numbers have been agreed upon by EG&G/Parsons ES and the contaminant mass of sludge beneath the engineered cover will increase by approximately 1 percent.

It was agreed that an errata sheet would be issued to the copies that were provided for public comment.

4) Schedule for Future Meetings

Dr. Briand Wu proposed that it may be appropriate to have bi-weekly team meetings during the public review period. This issue will be discussed after the schedule question is resolved with respect to the second public review period for the CDPHE CAMU permit.

5) Building 964

The rationale for the early removal of Building 964 was discussed. The waste storage unit could be closed via its existing closure plan in the RCRA Part B Permit. Tim Kramer stated that the existing closure plan would require minor modifications to specify the waste handling and disposition alternatives. Harlen Ainscough specified that the concept has merit, but that he would like the DOE to prepare a written rationale as to why the building should be closed early. The rationale should also include the changes that are needed for the current RCRA closure plan, and what administrative method (class determination of the permit modification) should be used to implement the closure of the unit. Arturo Duran specified that the PAM process might be appropriate for the removal of Building 964. The PAM process is similar to a CERCLA Removal Action.

6) Next Meeting

The next working group meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 23, 1995.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Philip A. Nixon", is written over a horizontal line.

Philip A. Nixon
Project Manager, Phase I IM/IRA